

Federal district courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. Rowan & Son v. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 611 F.2d 997, 998 (5th Cir. 1980). They are empowered to adjudicate only those claims involving parties with diversity of citizenship, 28 U.S.C. § 1332, and those claims arising from a federal question. 28 U.S.C. § 1331.


Plaintiff's claim appears to involve a simple contract dispute rather than a federal question. Thus, plaintiff's claim is actionable in this Court only if she can show diversity jurisdiction. For diversity jurisdiction to attach, there must be complete diversity of citizenship between the parties, i.e., the plaintiff's citizenship must be diverse from the citizenship of the defendant. Catepillar, Inc. v. Lewis, 117 S.Ct. 467, 472 (1996). Moreover, there must be an amount in controversy exceeding the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interests and costs. 28 U.S.C. § 1332 (a).

In this instance, there does appear to be a diversity of citizenship between the parties. However, the amount in controversy is only \$5,000. Docket Entry No. 1 at pg. 4. As a consequence, this Court has no jurisdiction to adjudicate the plaintiff's claim.

A district court is obliged to consider matters of jurisdiction, *sua sponte* if necessary. Hadley v. Werner, 753 F.2d 514, 516 (6th Cir.1985). Here, the plaintiff has failed to show that her claim falls within the scope of this Court's jurisdiction. Accordingly, this action is hereby DISMISSED for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

Entry of this order shall constitute the judgment in this action.

It is so ORDERED.


Todd Campbell
United States District Judge